

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

I am not pleading that I am the only one who has made his way through this world and is now sitting in the Senate, nor am I pleading poverty or hard knocks as a reason why I should sit in this body. I am giving to the Senators the truth as to why these men voted for me for United States Senator. I am not pleading for sympathy. I do not want sympathy. This is not a question of sympathy. It is a question of right or wrong. If the Senate can believe me to be the low, vile creature the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New York and other Senators who have talked against me would have you believe me to be, then there is a plain duty staring you squarely in the face, regardless of the testimony in this record. If I could be the foul wretch that you, Senators, have sought to paint me, regardless of how I came here, by right or by wrong, I should be driven from yonder door with the stamp of infamy branded upon my back. I am not pleading for sympathy. I am trying to narrate the truth of my election as it was, not as Senators would have the Senate believe it.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM LORIMER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 22, 1911



WASHINGTON

1911

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM LORIMER.

The Senate having under consideration the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections relating to charges preferred against William Lorimer, a Senator from the State of Illinois—

Mr. LORIMER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I understand that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] was discussing the Illinois election yesterday and failed to conclude his remarks. I prefer to go on with my remarks at this time, but if the Senator from Indiana desires to conclude his remarks before I proceed I shall be very glad to yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. BEVERIDGE: The Senator can proceed. Besides, he does so under a unanimous consent agreement, and it would not be possible for me to change it.

Mr. LORIMER: Mr. President, many questions have been suggested by the statements of Senators in the debate on this case. Those suggestions concern mostly the actual condition of my election to this body.

Did I organize the Illinois Legislature against Hopkins?

Did I make Shurtleff speaker in order to be elected Senator?

Did I make Lee O'Neil Browne my agent—my corrupt agent?

Why did I stay in Springfield during the contest?

For what purpose did I talk to Shepherd in the speaker's room?

Why did the Democrats vote for me?

These are some of the questions suggested by the statements of Senators in opposition to the committee report or openly put by them in the course of debate. To these questions many sorts of answers have been given by my opponents. Some of those answers have been fanciful theories, some mere guesses and surmises. There is only one kind of answer that should stand or that should count in this case; that is the plain matter-of-fact simple truth. It is this matter of fact, this truth, that I propose to lay before the Senate to-day.

I rise to-day simply to tell, as one who lived through it all, exactly how my election at Springfield was brought about, to answer the foregoing questions with the facts that alone can answer them correctly.

There has been an effort made to cover this whole case with a cloud of suspicion, to make it appear that some man with a powerful intellect, a powerful ability to organize men, by some well-laid scheme prepared a plan to organize the legislature for the purpose of defeating Senator Hopkins and to elect a United States Senator. Some Senators have intimated that that man with the powerful mind and wonderful genius of organization was no other person than myself. I propose to address myself to the statements made by those Senators and on which they expect to build the structure that will create in the minds of Senators in this body the impression that I was not only, as they say, elected by corrupt practices, but that I am the man that was responsible for them.

To begin with, Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] in his statement said:

It is also clear from the record that Mr. LORIMER was determined to organize the legislature against Hopkins and Gov. Deneen.

Anybody who knows aught of the organization of that legislature would not make that statement. The facts are that I was not determined to organize the legislature against Gov. Deneen, and, if I had been so determined, under the conditions existing at that time, it would have been impossible for me to do so. To organize a legislature with the aid of Democrats and Republicans is a matter that can not be done just by a wish or a thought. It requires constant effort to bring about a condition of that sort, which Senators would have us understand was a well-defined plan in the head of just one man.

It happened that on the 15th of September I was stricken with illness, and from that day until November I was unable to leave my home. My physicians would not even permit friends to call upon me. I did not leave home until just a few days before the general November election, when I went to my office where I might be seen for an hour during each day in order that the public might know that there was hope for my recovery, as it had been stated in the congressional district in which I was a candidate for re-election that LORIMER was about to die, and "they had better elect somebody who would be alive when the governor issues the certificate of election."

Immediately after the election I took the train for the Pacific coast to go into the mountains for my health, and I traveled along the Pacific coast, and finally landed in the city of Portland. I remember well speaking for a few moments during my presence there to the Commercial Association of that city about waterway improvements, and the senior Senator from that State [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] was present at that meeting. A day or two after that I was again stricken, with blood poisoning; was operated upon, and lived in the Portland Hotel, until I was taken back to Chicago, accompanied almost the whole distance to my city by my surgeon. From there I returned to Washington, as will be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of the House of Representatives. There it can be found that I voted during the early part of that session. After the holidays, on the very day on which Mr. Shurtleff was elected speaker, I was in the House of Representatives, and the RECORD shows that I made a motion on the 7th day of January, the day following his election.

Edward Shurtleff was elected speaker of the house of representatives because of a condition that arose there, and if the same condition arose anywhere else in the country the result would have been the same. The governor of our State was very much opposed to the re-election of Mr. Shurtleff and he called in a few of the men, members of the State house of representatives, over whom he had much influence, and told them that they must organize that body by the election of some person speaker other than Edward Shurtleff. He told them that he did not care who was elected speaker, but that under no circumstances must any Republican vote for Edward Shurtleff, and if they did vote for him, he served notice on them that not one of them could expect to receive patronage at the hands of his administration, and he went even further than that.

He called in Representative Brady, who had pledged his support to Shurtleff for speaker, and told him unless he joined with the men who were trying to organize that body under his dictatorship, every man who was in the employ of the State on Brady's recommendation would be forthwith dismissed. In other words, the governor of our State undertook to dictate to the general assembly who should be its speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LORIMER. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that statement is a statement of the fact, I would like to ask why it was not put in the record, and why Gov. Deneen was not summoned as a witness, so that he could confront a statement of that kind and have the same opportunity to make reply to it that the Senator has opportunity to make the charge of this floor after the evidence is all closed.

Mr. LORIMER. I am quite unable to answer the question as the Senator would desire to have me do it, for the reason that, first, I was not a member of the committee that investigated the charges.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think it only fair as a member of the committee to suggest that the Senator from Illinois is replying to statements made upon the floor of the Chamber, and not to statements made in Chicago at the hearings. Consequently he could not have anticipated the questions raised by Members here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois further yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to have this understood now. If questions asked of the sitting Member are embarrassing because they are being asked now at this critical point in the case, and we are to refrain on that account from asking them, I want to know it, and I will try to observe the rule in that respect.

Mr. LORIMER. May I not say at the outset that I have no objection to any Senator asking any question that suggests itself to him at any time during the discussion of this question.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes.

Mr. BURROWS. May I suggest that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to make his statement in order, and then at the close if any Senator desires to ask questions it will be of course agreeable to him. But I think it is no more than fair to the Senator that he be permitted to make his statement without interruption.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. President—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just one word further—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois further yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On account of the importance of this matter I want to understand the situation. If the Senator from Illinois is simply making a statement in the form of an argument and not as a witness in the case, I want to know it. If he is making a statement which he desires to submit as evidence in this case, then it seems to me we should have the opportunity to cross-examine him if we desire.

Mr. LORIMER. Again I wish to state that while I appreciate the courtesy which the Senator from Michigan desires to have extended to me, that I may proceed with my remarks without interruption, I shall have no hesitancy at any point during the time I have the floor in answering any question that any Senator may see fit to ask.

I stated that I was in no way connected with the committee which investigated these charges and had no right to summon Mr. Deneen. During the whole investigation, from the day that I submitted the resolution last May to make this inquiry, no Senator, whether he be a member of the subcommittee, the whole committee, or any Senator in this body will say that I have ever suggested anything to him or made any appeal to him or in any way at any time tried to influence his judgment as to how he should vote in my case. And so I made no suggestions to the committee about who should be called. If the Senator from South Dakota is dissatisfied because the governor of our State was not called to refute these statements, I am not to blame for it. But it would have been impossible to refute this statement, because the cause for making it was not suggested to me until the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] made his speech upon this floor just a short time ago.

Mr. President, the Senator in his statement said that it was clear from the evidence that I was determined to organize the legislature for the purpose of defeating Senator Hopkins. I have in my hand a list of the Republican members of the house—24 in all—who voted for Mr. Shurtleff for speaker, and of the 24 Republicans who voted for Shurtleff for speaker 17 voted for Senator Hopkins for United States Senator—some of them one day, some of them a week, some a month, some for two months, and some of them voted for him on every ballot on which the roll was called, including the ballot on which I was elected.

If the theory be correct that I had been conjuring schemes to organize the legislature for dark-lantern purposes, as the Senator suggested, how can it be proven by the statement that I was trying to defeat Hopkins by making Shurtleff speaker when the journal of the house shows that 17 of the 24 Republicans who voted for Shurtleff also voted for Hopkins for United States Senator?

Mr. President, in order that there may be no trouble in verifying this statement, I ask permission to have the names printed in the RECORD in order that Senators may very easily consult the journal of the house and find from it whether or not this statement is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the matter will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOW REPUBLICANS WHO VOTED FOR SHURTLEFF FOR SPEAKER VOTED LATER ON FOR SENATOR.

Behrens	Hopkins.	Lane	Hopkins.
Bush	Hopkins.	Lederer	Mason.
Chilperfield	Hopkins.	McNichols	Hopkins.
Crawford	Hopkins.	Nelson	Hopkins.
Curran	Shurtleff.	Parker	Hopkins.
Dudgeon	Hopkins.	Schumacher	Hopkins.
Erby	Hopkins.	Shanahan	Shurtleff.
Gillespie	Hopkins.	Smejkal	Shurtleff.
Glade	Hopkins.	Stearns	Foss.
Hope	Hopkins.	Zaabel (died Jan. 13, 1909).	
Ireland	Hopkins.	Zinger	Hopkins.
Kittleman	Hopkins.	Zipf	Foss.

Hopkins's vote, 17.

Mr. LORIMER. Suppose that the President of the United States—a President of the United States, I care not who he be—should call in the Senators of his party, tell them who he wanted for President pro tempore of the Senate, tell them how he wanted the Senate committees organized, tell them that unless they did his bidding they could get no patronage under his administration, and tell them that if they failed to do his bidding every last man employed by the Government on their recommendation should be driven from public employment. Suppose a President could fall so low as to undertake such a feat as that, and that he succeeded in getting into an organization a majority of the members of this body of his own party to carry out his orders to the exclusion of one man and those who were favorable to him; what do you suppose the Senators would do? What do you suppose party lines would accomplish? It would not take the Senators of this body one moment to make up their minds to cross the party lines and organize the Senate with men who they thought were fit to hold the different offices in the control of this body.

The men in our State did what any set of sensible, courageous men would do. They organized the body regardless of the wishes of the executive branch of the government. If the governor of our State had attended to his own business, said nothing to the members of the house, permitted them without coercion to go on and organize that body, Mr. Shurtleff would have been the choice of 90 per cent of its members, and he would have been elected in the Republican caucus by a unanimous vote. I call for the journal of the Illinois Assembly to justify that statement.

Edward Shurtleff was serving his fourth term in that body. He had twice been its speaker, elected twice before the time we are now discussing by the unanimous vote of his party in the Republican caucus and in the lower house. So, Mr. President, Edward Shurtleff, whom the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] would have you believe to be a vile and corrupt man, had twice before presided over the house; and, may I say, he was elected both times without help from me, even without my knowledge until I saw the reports in the paper.

He is not a speaker of my making. He was not a man of power because I gave it to him. I scarcely knew him when he was elected speaker of that body the first and the second time. He owes me nothing, not even support, for promotion to that great office in our State. I was not on more than speaking terms with him until I went to Springfield to secure legislation on the waterway. I could say no more to him than

"How do you do, sir," until that time; and the idea that a man could work himself up through the world and become speaker of the house of representatives of that great State, without my aid, and at the same time be known as my political henchman, is the most absurd thing that I have ever known to be stated in this body or any other body in which I have ever served.

That I elected a bitter enemy of Hopkins and my henchman speaker is what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] stated. The contrary is just the truth. Mr. Shurtleff would not have been a member of that general assembly but for the urgent request of Mr. Hopkins and his friends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will kindly suspend while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. BORAH. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none. The unfinished business is temporarily laid aside. The Senator from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. President, Mr. Shurtleff was a candidate for re-election at the earnest request of Senator Hopkins and the friends of Senator Hopkins. They have a rule in his senatorial district that is lived up to religiously, and always has been during the time that candidates were nominated by delegate conventions. A senator's term is for four years, and every time a senator's term expires it goes around to another county. So it was due to go to McHenry county, in which Mr. Shurtleff lived. A friend of Shurtleff was a candidate for senator. Mr. Shurtleff had pledged him his support, and because Mr. Hopkins and his friends knew that there would be a contest over the election of Senator and because they wanted well-informed and influential men in the State legislature when the senatorial election was to come up they pleaded with Mr. Shurtleff to become a candidate. He told them in response that he had given his word to support his friend for senator. They immediately went to this friend and pleaded with him to go to Shurtleff and ask him to become a candidate, which he did. It was on that request and on that release that he became a candidate again for the house.

As the campaign went on much talk was heard everywhere as to whether candidates would pay any attention to the advisory vote. May I not say to the Senator from South Dakota that it was generally the opinion of the people in our State that no candidate would heed the advisory vote unless it happened that he had the plurality or the majority.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LORIMER. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to understand the Senator. Does the Senator mean to say that Mr. Shurtleff was a supporter of Mr. Hopkins?

Mr. LORIMER. I will come to that in a moment, if the Senator will permit me to just go along a little further.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Senator mean to distinguish the people of Illinois when he says that all the candidates there decided among themselves that they would disregard the vote of those people unless it happened to be in favor of the candidate?

Mr. LORIMER. I mean to say that the candidates did not intend to regard the primary vote. That is what I mean to say, and I mean to prove that by showing that every candidate before the primary, whether he got the majority or not, was a candidate and was voted for during the session of the general assembly on almost every ballot.

But that is not the point, Mr. President. I want to show that Mr. Shurtleff was a friend of Senator Hopkins. He lived in Senator Hopkins's congressional district. He had been for him as the candidate for Congress for 16 or 18 years. When Mr. Hopkins was elected to this body Mr. Shurtleff was in the legislature and was one of his campaign managers and voted for him and helped to elect him to this body. But after Mr. Shurtleff had become a candidate, as I was about to say, all candidates were looking out for themselves regardless of the result of the primary election, and in order to protect themselves Mr. Hopkins's friends went to Mr. Shurtleff and discussed with him the probability of some other person securing a majority or a plurality in the State, and they asked him what he would do under those circumstances. He said that he would abide by the result of the vote of the Republicans in his own legislative district. They asked him if he would write a letter to that effect. He said he would; and he did write the letter; and that was satisfactory to Mr. Hopkins and to his friends, because it was the identical thing that they wanted him to do.

Then the primary election came on. Mr. Hopkins and his friends were sure that Hopkins would get the primary vote in his congressional district, because he had represented the district in Congress for many, many years. But when the vote was cast it was learned that Mr. Hopkins was beaten in the district by Congressman Foss. When Mr. Shurtleff was consulted about what he would do, he stated that he had written a letter declaring to his constituents what he would do; that he had pledged himself to abide by the majority or the plurality of his district, and that he intended to keep his word and vote for Mr. Foss; and he voted for Mr. Foss on every roll call except three. On two roll calls he voted for Gov. Deneen, and on one roll call, the last, he voted to elect me to this body.

That is the story, and it is the everlasting truth about Mr. Shurtleff and as to his being a henchman of LORIMER.

Then, Mr. President, we go along just a little further in the speech, and we find this statement in the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]:

The next move was to install Lee O'Neil Browne to the position of minority leader of the Democratic minority in the house.

Let us see how near to the facts that statement runs. Lee O'Neil Browne was elected minority leader, and he was elected minority leader after a contest infinitely more bitter within the lines of his own party than the one in which Mr. Shurtleff was concerned. Mr. Tippit, the other candidate of the Democratic members of the general assembly, was as much opposed to Mr. Browne's leadership as the Governor was to Mr. Shurtleff's leadership. The fight had gone on for many months, but at the end Mr. Browne was selected as the leader of the Democratic minority.

But, Mr. President, not one man of that minority was ever spoken to by me in behalf of Mr. Browne or anybody else, and no man was ever spoken to in behalf of Mr. Browne through anybody else for me.

The proof of it is apparent. If you read the journal of the joint session when I was elected to this body you will find there among the 53 Democrats that voted for me the name of Thomas Tippit and 16 of his followers. Suppose for an instant I had gone in with the power it would be made to appear, from the statement of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], I wielded in the Democratic party, that I had gone into their party affairs, and undertaken to foist Mr. Browne on the shoulders of Mr. Tippit and his friends, would they have voted to send me to this body after I had been responsible for their defeat, their humiliation, and their probable political destruction?

When one comes to know all the history of the organization of the house of representatives, he finds that there was nothing in it that would justify the statement made upon this floor about my connection with Mr. Shurtleff's elevation to the speakership and my connection with Mr. Browne's elevation to the leadership of the minority of the Democratic party in my State.

Labored efforts have been made to show that I organized the legislature to defeat Gov. Deneen and Senator Hopkins in their united effort to return the latter to the Senate. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the facts. The first ballot for United States Senator was taken in the separate branches. In the senate Mr. Hopkins received a majority, and in the house he received 61 votes out of a total of 146. The following members of the house belonging to and co-operating with the Deneen faction cast their votes for candidates other than Senator Hopkins:

Abbey	Church	Hull	Price
Ap Madoc	Fulton	Maclean	Reynolds
Butts	Hagan	Pierson	Sollitt

The following members of the house, also of the Deneen faction, failed to respond to their names on the roll call:

Campbell	Scanlan	Ton
----------	---------	-----

The presence, however, of these members on the following day, as shown by the roll call, shows at least that they were able to be there, had they been interested in securing the election of Senator Hopkins. In proof of the statement that the 15 members named above belonged to Gov. Deneen's faction, I invite an inspection of the journal of the Illinois House on the vote for the election of speaker, where it will be seen that they voted for Edward J. King, the governor's candidate. Had these Deneen followers voted for Mr. Hopkins, he would have received a majority of the votes of the house as well as of the senate, and there could have been no deadlock.

Here is the story in figures:

Total vote cast in house.....	146
Necessary to a choice.....	74
Voting for Senator Hopkins.....	61
Add Deneen votes indicated above.....	15

Making a total for Hopkins of.....	76
or a majority of.....	2

Now, Mr. President we come to another very important branch of this discussion. Take the journal of the house, and what will you find there? Republican members of the lower house

from the district I live in and with whom I am supposed to have influence voted for Mr. Hopkins, including the senator from the district. Every Republican member from the congressional district I represented voted for Senator Hopkins. The record will show that Schumacher and Kittleman and Cruikshank and Ball and McNichols, all from my congressional district, voted for Senator Hopkins.

Let me call your attention to the fact that Gov. Deneen is and was the father of the direct primary, and he traveled from one end of our State to the other urging upon the people to send members to the general assembly to make a direct primary vote the law of our State, and but for him it would not be on our statute books to-day. He used all the arguments that are used by the direct-primary advocates in favor of such a law. He was for it and he got it.

When the roll call was had in the separate branches of our general assembly, the first roll call on senatorship, what do we find by the journal? We find that every single member of that general assembly from Gov. Deneen's own legislative district voted for some person other than Senator Hopkins.

Senator Lundberg, Representative Church, and Representative Fulton, from Mr. Deneen's own district, two from his own ward and his own neighborhood, nominated through his influence and through the power of his organization, voted against Mr. Hopkins for United States Senator. Every member of his congressional district but one, Mr. Kowalski, voted against Hopkins, and Mr. Kowalski changed his vote the next day and never voted for him again. That is the truth, and that is what the house journal will demonstrate to any man who will take the time to make an investigation.

So, Mr. President, the simple statement of the truth does away with the house organization by and on the part of LORIMER to elect himself Senator and to promote, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] says, dark-lantern schemes; and that is what becomes of the statement that it was done to defeat Senator Hopkins.

But that is not all. There were other days on which votes were had for the election of United States Senator.

At the first meeting of the joint assembly:

Total number of votes cast was.....	199
Necessary to a choice.....	100
Hopkins received	89
Foss received	16
Mason received	6
Shurtleff received	12
Stringer received	76

There were present and voting on that day for candidates other than Senator Hopkins, 13 members of the general assembly, who were of the Deneen faction, viz:

Senators:

Hay

Olsen

Schmidt

Representatives:

Ap Madoc

Hagan

Price

Sollitt

Butts

Kowalski

Reynolds

Ton

Church

Maclean

Number of votes cast for Hopkins.....	89
Add the above named.....	13

102

Necessary to a choice.....	100
----------------------------	-----

Hopkins's majority 2

If the 13 members named above with whom Gov. Deneen had a controlling influence had voted that day for Senator Hopkins, he would have been elected on the first ballot taken in the joint assembly or on any succeeding ballot that day.

Mr. President, that is not only so of that roll call, but there were five roll calls on that day, and if Gov. Deneen and his friends and the men who were promoting or supposed to be promoting the candidacy of Senator Hopkins had voted for him he would have been elected on any ballot on that day.

As proof of this statement the record will show that the day did come when the men to whom I have referred did vote exactly as Gov. Deneen wanted them to vote. That was the day of the last roll call when I was elected to this body. Weeks before Gov. Deneen had told many of his friends to help elect me. They told me so, I told them I would not accept their support unless they told the governor that if they once pledged their support to me under no conditions would they ever break their word.

The day before the roll call on which I was elected the governor called these men into the mansion and into his office and told them that LORIMER must not be elected; that it would be better to have no election, to allow nobody to be elected, and to let the legislature adjourn without the selection of a United States Senator; and these men one after another stated to him:

I have given my word to LORIMER; I will not break it. If you thought it wrong to elect him you should not have permitted me to become pledged to him with your consent.

These men gave me their support to the end.

Those of the Deneen faction who had promised me their support and who broke their word when the roll was called, and those the governor controlled who had not promised to support me, on the final roll call at the governor's suggestion, supported Hopkins. When the time arrived that he wanted to place them either in one column or the other, they went where the governor suggested they should go. So, Mr. President, it was not a prolonged fight to defeat Hopkins. Hopkins was beaten on the first day. Hopkins was beaten on the second day. After the first session of the joint assembly the question was no more about Hopkins, but it was who can, under these conditions, be elected to the United States Senate? That was the question from the first day and from the second day, and then began the effort to elect a United States Senator upon whom the Republicans could agree.

I talked with the governor every week I was in that city, and I urged for weeks and weeks that he himself become the candidate of the party. I told him I believed if he would take the place our party, rent asunder with factional strife, would be united. The lieutenant governor of our State is the son of Gov. Oglesby, who had been governor of our State two terms and served one term in this body. The name of Oglesby is cherished by every citizen of Illinois, I care not the party to which he belongs. Oglesby was nominated under a direct primary without any organization. The governor was against him and all the governor's organization was opposed to him. Ex-Gov. Yates was a candidate for governor and his friends opposed Oglesby. The result of it reminds me of a statement that I heard former Senator Mason make to a large mass meeting in Springfield immediately after McKinley was nominated for President. He said:

All the politicians were against McKinley; all the men who have influence were against him; there was nobody for him but the people.

Oglesby was nominated by the people of the State without the support of any faction, and I believed, and other Republicans believed, that if Deneen was elected to this body and Oglesby became the governor, that he would unite the party and harmonize the differences of the factions, and we would be able to go to the polls with a solid front in the future as we had done in the past in our State.

I talked with the governor and labored with him until long about the 15th of March. About that time he said he felt that he could not take the place, but he led me to believe that, if the party could be united upon him, he would take the place. I asked him to send for the chairman or the State central committee, Mr. West, his close friend, so that we might discuss the matter. Mr. West came to Springfield and the Republicans consulted about the advisability of electing the governor. Enough of them pledged themselves to support him to make his election assured. On that night at about 11 o'clock, after I had understood from Mr. West that the governor would be a candidate, Mr. West came to the hotel at which I was stopping and said that the governor would not be a candidate.

From the day that Senator Hopkins was defeated until the 23d day of March, when Mr. Deneen refused positively to be a candidate, we were endeavoring to secure the election of Deneen, and not LORIMER, as United States Senator.

When the governor refused to be a candidate, I consulted him about many other men, and among them Mr. Foss, who was voted for every day. Then I talked with him about Col. LOWDEN, a Member of the House of Representatives, Representative MCKINLEY, and Representative RODENBERG, but before I came to discuss any of these names I urged upon him the name of Edward Shurtleff, the speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives. His name was discussed not by the governor and myself alone, but by the governor and his friends—his newspaper friends, and they are all-powerful and absolutely controlling with him. Mr. Noyes, who was then the editor of the Record-Herald, said that he would not agree to Mr. Shurtleff's election. Mr. Noyes is now president of the Star Company in the city of Washington, where Senators can easily reach him and verify this statement. For about three weeks we were trying to elect Shurtleff.

Then came the discussion on this other set of men, and it was not until it had become apparent that the governor would not support any of those men that at his urgent suggestion I considered the advisability of becoming a candidate. This same Mr. Noyes was interviewed by my friend Mr. Shanahan, who was a member of the legislature. Mr. Noyes said he had no objection to Mr. Deneen joining to elect LORIMER to the Senate, but that he personally could not declare in his favor; that he had fought him for so many years that he could not turn in one night and support him, but that he did believe—and he did tell this to Mr. Shanahan—that Mr. LORIMER was the only Republican in Illinois who could afford to be elected by the aid of Democratic votes; that it would not injure him politically to receive the support of Democrats, because he had been elected to the House time after time from a Democratic district by the aid of Democratic votes; that everybody would concede that

LORIMER could be elected without injury to himself or to the party politically; and if Mr. Deneen wanted to join with him he had no objection.

Mr. President, that is the statement of fact; that is the true history of the senatorial election in the State of Illinois up to this point. Does that show that months before the legislature convened I was conjuring up in my mind a plot by which I could elect my "henchman" as speaker of the general assembly, and, through the power of that office, foist myself onto that general assembly and place myself in this body? If that truth demonstrates that theory, then I have nothing more to say.

Then we come to another important question in this discussion.

The investigation—

Said the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR]—

The investigation concerns itself with the way in which those 108 votes were procured. It is practically concentrated upon the way in which the 53 Democratic votes were secured, because it was a matter for special inquiry that 53 Democrats should leave the candidate of their own primary and unite upon a candidate of the opposite party.

If this were the only case of the kind in history, Mr. President, Senators might inquire why Democrats voted for LORIMER, but history is teeming with testimony to the effect that men have been elected to this body by votes of the opposite party.

But here we come, it strikes me, to a point where the question arises how it was that 53 Democrats voted for LORIMER. It is not a very long story, or it is a long story, according to the way it is told, but I shall not test the patience of the Senate by going into a detailed history of the things that brought about this condition. I shall, however, ask a little time of the Senate to answer the question of the Senator from New York.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1895 I made up my mind that I should try to do something more than vote for appropriation bills in return for what the people had done for me. I lived in and represented the district in which is located the great Chicago Drainage Canal, which is intended ultimately to be a portion of a great waterway to be established between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico. I have been urging upon Congress during my service the importance of such an improvement, and I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House, will bear me out in the statement that I was constantly at work trying to secure the attention and the aid of Congress for that development, and that I was largely responsible for all the appropriations that were made for the surveys of that project. I found that it was going to cost a great deal of money, the expenditure of vast millions of dollars, and that more than the effort and more than the voice of one man would be required to secure the money requisite to make the improvement. After many years of personal effort I decided that if the improvement was worth while, and the people of the valley came to know that it could be made, and if it were worth enough to them to have it made, if they were informed on the subject, they would support a movement to make the improvement. So I built a little boat—I think it was in 1904—only about 26 feet long, for the express

purpose of organizing the Mississippi Valley for that project. One day, with four of my colleagues from Illinois, and my two sons to operate the boat—I will pause just a moment to say that of these four Members of the House, the only Democrat in that body from that State, HENRY RAINEY, was one of that number—we began our trip from Lake Michigan to the Gulf. We stopped at almost every town along the Illinois and the Mississippi Rivers, discussing the matter with the people, organizing in every one of the places where we stopped a Lakes-to-the-Gulf deep waterway association. As we passed down through the valley one Member for one reason and another Member for another went back home, and we filled his place with a Member that we picked up along the route. When we left Chicago we had on board of Members of the other House, four Republicans and one Democrat, Mr. RAINEY, and when we landed in New Orleans we had on board four Democrats and one Republican.

So the work of organizing this association was divided equally from the beginning to the end among Democrats and Republicans, no man and no party seeking to take advantage over the other. Out of these organizations we formed a central organization, held our first convention in St. Louis, and there perfected a permanent Lakes-to-the-Gulf Deep Waterway Association. The following year we accompanied President Roosevelt down the Mississippi River in the interest of this project to the great city of Memphis, all the people turning out to make a holiday.

In the next convention, at Chicago, attended by over 4,000 delegates from the valley, we had upon the platform in the Auditorium, speaking in favor of this project, the Democratic and the Republican candidates for the Presidency—Mr. Bryan and Mr. Taft, our President to-day.

After the convention at Memphis I went back home to my State. Some question had been raised in the House as to whether the Federal Government should make the improvement between Lockport and Utica, in the Illinois valley, a distance of about 60 miles. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors raised that question, and it seemed apparent that unless that portion of the work was done by the people of Illinois, in addition to the other 40 miles which they had built at a cost of over \$60,000,000, it would be impossible to get this work under way. So I went back home to my own State where our legislature was in session. I proposed to them that they submit a constitutional amendment to the people authorizing an expenditure of \$20,000,000 to do that work. Here [exhibiting] is a copy of the document containing the arguments that were made, running over a period of several weeks.

After the discussion was completed, the general assembly unanimously, every Democrat and every Republican favoring it, voted to submit a constitutional amendment to the people of our State to decide whether or not \$20,000,000 should be expended for the purpose I have indicated. I remember that, when I was discussing the subject before the general assembly, one gentleman asked me what I thought the people would do about the question? I told him if they passed the resolution and submitted it to the people, and nothing more was done, the people would not adopt the constitutional amendment, for few of them knew anything about it and a lesser number knew any-

thing of the benefits that would come to the State by the development of this great waterway. I pledged them there that if they would submit the amendment to the people I would go myself into every part of our state, explain the benefits to come to the people, and trust to them to vote an approval.

The legislature submitted the constitutional amendment, and I immediately began the work of organizing the citizens of our State in favor of the project. This work was not confined to Republicans; it was not confined to Democrats; it was not confined to Socialists; it was not confined to Prohibitionists; it was taken even to the homes of men who believed in no party. We organized every precinct in Illinois outside of the city of Chicago by getting people who were interested in the progress of our State—Democrats and Republicans and members of other parties alike. Wherever a county or a town was made up overwhelmingly of Republicans we installed a Democrat for president of the association, and where it was overwhelmingly Democratic we installed a Republican for president of the association; so that every man with whom we talked and worked was impressed with the non-partisan character of this movement in our State.

I traveled from one end of Illinois to the other, speaking once, twice, three times a day, all the way from two hours a day to five hours a day, interesting the people in this project. At the end of the campaign in September, 1908, the work had been so exhausting that I was not able to say even one word in my Congressional district during that campaign, and I had naught to do with my election to Congress the last time.

Would you know the character of people who were interested in the movement? We interested the best men of the State. When we went to Bloomington, a town in a county that is overwhelmingly Republican, we had as our presiding officer and the head of our organization there a gentleman who once graced the chair as president of this body—Adlai E. Stevenson, a Democrat. It was that class of men that were interested in this work. I traveled from county to county with Hon. HENRY RAINEY, spoke from the same platform with him day after day, and in every place a Republican speaker was supplemented by some leading Democrat, either from that community or from some other community in the State.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to the roster of that organization. There it is (exhibiting), 50,000 Democrats and Republicans, about evenly divided, in the precincts outside of the city of Chicago.

When the campaign for the waterway amendment was over and the vote was had, the people announced what they thought of it. That vote was cast on the same day that the President was elected and on the same day that the governor was elected. The vote cast for governor was approximately 1,079,000; the vote cast for President was approximately 1,080,000; the vote cast for the constitutional amendment for the deep waterway was approximately 887,000. The plurality that Governor Deneen received was approximately 23,000; the plurality that President Taft received was approximately 179,000; but the majority for the constitutional amendment was approximately 497,000, almost a half million majority, showing how the people of Illinois, men of all parties, look upon this question.

Result of election.

	Vote.	Plurality.
For governor:		
Deneen	550,076	
Stevenson	526,912	
	1,079,988	23,164
For President:		
Taft	629,932	
Bryan	450,810	
	1,080,742	179,122
Amendment to constitution:		
For	629,522	
Against	195,177	
	887,699	497,345

Mr. President, that was the result of the work of over 13 years for this improvement. It was accomplished just exactly as I have stated to you, by the aid of all of the people of the State, regardless of party and regardless of any partisanship. That is one of the reasons why I was able to secure Democratic votes, as I shall show to you later.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Root] further said:

Now, there are certain undisputed facts which bear upon this inquiry as to these 53 Democratic votes. The first which I ask you to consider is that Mr. LORIMER was present at Springfield and in attendance at the State capital at the time of this election, and he had been there for several weeks.

The Senator wants you to know that when I was elected to this body I was present at the capital of Illinois and had been there for several weeks. Yes, Mr. President, I had been there for several weeks, and all the time that I could spare from my duties in the other branch of Congress during the session of the legislature, after its organization was perfected, I put in at Springfield, and I was there when I was elected, and I was there to render effective the work done when the constitutional amendment was submitted to the people—to urge the general assembly to pass a bill to carry out the purposes of that amendment, to provide for an organization through which this work could be done and this \$20,000,000 expended. There was a difference between the governor and myself on that question.

I had pledged the people that in so far as I had influence not one dollar of the twenty million should be spent until Congress agreed to co-operate with our State and appropriated the money requisite to finish the project from the Lakes to the Gulf. We had much discussion on that question. I told the governor that I would support, with all the influence I had, a bill to give him absolute control of the work; to place the appointment of all the officials in his hands for the expenditure of the \$20,000,000; and that the only thing I exacted, in so far as I was concerned, was that the money should not be spent until Congress authorized the Federal Government to co-operate with our State.

He wanted the money to be spent for the development of water power. We disagreed, and the contest went on until the last day of the session, when it became known that no bill could be passed because the adherents of one policy were not strong

enough to pass it and those of the other policy would not yield a peg. So, Mr. President, I was in Springfield as I have been many, many times before.

I should like to know from the Senator from New York if he has ever been identified with a work of this kind, if he has ever come in contact with his Democratic brethren and worked with them in season and out of season for a project that would not benefit them alone, but would benefit the whole people of his State? If he has been connected with such a work, will he tell me, or will he tell anybody, that when he was doing that work he was not making friends among the people of his State regardless of their party affiliations?

But there is, Mr. President, an abundance of evidence here to show that work in favor of things that help a great State is appreciated by the people who receive the benefit of the effort, and I have here a list of Democrats who voted for me on account of the fact that they felt I had been doing something, that I had been helping in a work that meant much to Illinois, and that if they promoted me to a seat where I would be secure for four or six years this improvement would ultimately be made.

I mention as the first Democrat Senator Hearn. Oh, if there be a Democrat in Illinois, surely Senator Hearn is that man. He had service as captain of Company G of the Fifth Missouri Infantry, in Cockrell's brigade, a Confederate general, and he served through the war as a Confederate soldier. If you think he is not a Democrat go and talk with him. He was one of the men who was in the forefront of this work. He aided in every way that he could to pass the proposed amendment in the house. At that time he was in service in that body. He worked throughout his district with me and with others. But the thing above all things that I am confident caused Senator Hearn to vote for me was not alone that I was for this project, but because he became convinced that I was not trying to get advantage over any Democrat.

He was fond of Congressman RAINEY, and he knew that I had never taken a step in this work from the time we began the organization until he voted for me, until I had consulted with Congressman RAINEY. He was really the leading Democrat in my State in this work, and it was because of the work and because of the fact that I was not trying to get advantage and because I did what was in my power to put a Democrat in the forefront of the work, that he voted for me.

A few days before the vote was taken he came to me and told me all these things and he said: "LORIMER, I would like to vote for you, but I wish you would give me an additional reason for doing it." I asked him what request he had to make. He said, "If you could only go back to Washington as a Senator, and join with the Democrats and just cast one vote with them on the tariff bill, my conscience would feel easier, if I had voted for you." [Laughter.]

I said to him: "Senator, much as I appreciate the dignity of that office, if I can not go there and vote with the Republicans, the stalwart Republicans, I do not want a seat in the United States Senate." [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. No applause is permissible by occupants in the gallery.

Mr. LORIMER. Senator Hearn said, "Well, I guess I will have to vote for you anyhow." Then he went away, and when the roll was called he responded, and I received his vote.

In the campaign it happened that I talked at the home of Representative Blair, who voted for the constitutional amendment, and he had heard me talk about it before the general assembly. To make this campaign I had large maps made to illustrate the work, and after I had finished my talk before the people in his town, and the meeting had adjourned he came to me and said, "LORIMER, if you keep up that work you will be governor of Illinois, and when that day comes I will vote for you. That was the way that Democrat felt about the work for the waterway.

Then I went from there over to Franklin county, and I talked in the courthouse on this subject there, and when the meeting adjourned a great tall, fine looking gentleman came up to me, took me by the hand, and laying one hand on my shoulder said: "Mr. LORIMER, keep up that work. It has merit; the people will come to understand it after awhile, and this improvement will be made, and it will make you"—he was very enthusiastic—"governor, or it will make you Senator, or it will make you President of the United States; and when the time comes, and I am alive and I have the opportunity, you will get my vote."

At that time he had no idea of going to the legislature. But he was nominated by his party, and he was elected by his party, and when on the roll call the name of Sidney Espy was called Sidney Espy cast his vote for me; and there was no man in Springfield, and there is no man in Illinois, whether he be Democrat or Republican, who is a warmer and closer and more enthusiastic friend of mine than Sidney Espy, and for no other reason except the one I have explained.

Now we come to another name—Mr. Gorman, who lives in Peoria, another Democrat. When they began discussing the election of LORIMER, many of the influential people of his town came to Springfield—Democrats and Republicans alike. Peoria is on the Illinois river, and its people believe that the improved waterway will redound greatly to the benefit of their great city. The Democratic ex-mayor, the leader of the Democratic organization, was among the men. I had never seen Mayor O'Connor in my life until he came to Springfield. Those men urged their members of the legislature—Democrats and Republicans—to vote and work for LORIMER, with the result that I secured Gorman's vote, the Democrat, the vote of Black, Republican, and the vote of Butts, Republican, who had also been urged by Mr. Kenney, at the suggestion of Gov. Deneen. The Republican senator came to me before the roll was called and he said: "LORIMER, I wish I were free to vote for you." Senator Dailey further said: "The people of my city want me to vote for you, but I can not do it because I am chairman of Senator Hopkins's"—either his executive committee or his steering committee—"and I can not on that account vote for you. But I wish you godspeed." There is where the vote of Gorman came from.

Michael Link—you have heard much talk about Michael Link here, one of the men who it has been said was bribed to vote for me. When I made the campaign in his senatorial district in Madison county, where I talked every night to large crowds of people, Michael Link was on the platform with me, and I had

there with me also the Republican members of the legislature, and I told the people of their district that if this improvement should be made they would owe as much to these men, including Link, as to anybody else in the country. Madison county fronts on the river, and every man, woman and child in the district is for the improvement and anxious that this work shall be done.

Then the next one I come to in the waterway group is Representative Riley, a stanch old Democrat. I doubt if he ever voted for a Republican in his life, even for supervisor of his township. But if there be a father of the waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf it is Representative Riley. Years ago the people from our city went to the legislature to have the bill authorizing the construction of the canal passed. The mayor and many of our leading citizens spent several weeks there discussing the project. The legislature defeated their bill, and when they were gone Mr. Lyman E. Cooley, the engineer, and Mr. Riley took up the bill together, and at the end of several months Mr. Riley's bill became a law. The channel—160 feet wide in the rock and 24 feet deep—built from Chicago to Joliet, is the result of the work of Representative Riley.

He was in the last legislature; I had worked with him in season and out of season; and if there be anything on earth that would make Riley leave his party (and I am sure it is the only thing in the world he would leave it for) would be for the construction of a waterway from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. He was not only in this work, but more than 20 years ago he was the leader and the father of it all, and championed it and made it what it is.

Mr. Staymates is another Democrat; a man whose honesty no man on earth, who ever knew him, would impugn; a man who has devoted his time from the day we adopted the constitutional amendment up to this time in writing for all the papers that would take his copy on this subject; and he voted for me on that account.

We come to Henry Shephard. What about Henry Shephard? When the congressional party came back to Washington from New Orleans at the opening of Congress, I called a meeting of the men who had made the trip, and we organized among the Members of Congress an association. When I notified Mr. RAINEY, he told me that he could not attend that night because his friend, Henry Shephard, was in town. I invited Henry Shephard to come to that little dinner where we organized, and it was there that I first met Henry Shephard. It was there that he first became interested in this work. It was at that time that a friendship grew up between him and me that has lasted until to-day. Henry Shephard was a member of the legislature, and he was for this proposition all the way through.

The Senator asks why I was at Springfield when I was elected to the Senate. The Senator says that I was there for several weeks before I was elected to the Senate. Suppose I had no business there in favor of this waterway; suppose I had never had any interest in the development of my State and that the only thing I cared about was to get office for myself; suppose I had organized the legislature to elect myself to the Senate; and then suppose that for no other purpose, except to promote my election, I was in Springfield for several weeks before I was elected; then what of that? Is that proof of bribery? Is that evidence of corrupt practices, that a man who

is a candidate for office should go to those who have the votes with which he can secure office and tell them he wants their votes and ask them to be for him? Is that an evidence of corruption and bribery?

Great stress is laid on the fact that I was in Springfield. Has any Senator here ever been in Springfield or has any Senator here ever been at the capital of his State when they were discussing his election to this body? Is it a crime to be there? If it is, Mr. President, then I am guilty of that crime; I am guilty of being in Springfield; but it has always struck me that if a man wanted votes for United States Senator, wanted the support of his own legislature, and wanted a seat in this body, he had a right to go where the votes are; that he had a right to talk to the members of the legislature; and that if he did go there and if he did talk to the members of the legislature it was not evidence of bribery or corruption.

Mr. President, it is the talk of a child. No man who has ever had any experience in politics will pay any attention to a statement of that sort.

During the time that I have been actively identified with politics in my State, every time a Senator was elected, sometimes during the campaign for his election and frequently on the day he was elected, he was present in the capitol at Springfield. I have only to recall the memorable fight in 1885, when the legislature was in a deadlock. The Democrats had one-half of the strength of the body and the Republicans had the other. Gen. Logan had a seat in this body at that time, and he was a candidate for re-election. From the day the members of the general assembly began to assemble in Springfield, before the house or the senate was organized, Gen. Logan was on the ground. He was there talking to the members of the general assembly, and he was there during the whole winter, until the springtime, when he was finally returned to this body.

Did anybody cast suspicion upon Gen. Logan because he was present at the capital weeks before he was returned to this body? Not at all; and nobody ever thought of such a thing.

The only purpose, Mr. President, that there can be in throwing this seeming cloud of suspicion over this election is in order that Senators may believe I was not only elected to this body by bribery and corruption, but that I was present there and knew it was going on and was sanctioning that sort of thing. Any man who knows anything about that contest knows that the contrary is the fact in the case.

Now, we come to another set of Democrats who voted for LORIMER, the anti-Hopkins Democrats. There was present in that general assembly Representative George Alschuler, and he voted for LORIMER. George Alschuler lives in Hopkins's home town; he is his neighbor. May I say, in passing, that while he voted for LORIMER—and the brand of condemnation is asked for those who did vote for LORIMER—he was re-elected to the general assembly by an overwhelming majority, and he was elected leader of the minority, and he is now the minority leader of that body. He voted for me, I may say, because he was friendly; but that would not be sufficient reason. He voted for me because he was opposed to the election of Hopkins, and he announced it to everybody. There was not one man in Springfield who knew anything about the election but knew that George Alschuler would vote for any Republican or any

man of any other party in order to defeat Senator Hopkins. It was not a LORIMER vote; he belongs to nobody; but he was against Hopkins, and he announced in the beginning that if the time ever came when his vote could defeat Hopkins it would be cast for the man who would defeat him.

Then we come to another—the departed Charles Luke. Not one single man who had aught to do with the election of Senator, not one single man who was paying attention to the election of Senator but knew that Luke would vote for anybody in order to defeat Senator Hopkins. All who served with the Senator, either in the House or in this body, remember him very well. You knew him a lot better than I did, and I helped to send him here. It will be remembered that Senator Hopkins had one of the most bitter and most partisan tongues of any man who ever sat in this body. If he had a weakness at all, it was that. When he went through Luke's district he used that tongue for all it was worth denouncing Luke. He seldom made a campaign that he did not denounce Democrats everywhere he went.

It may be the right policy in a campaign; it may be the proper thing to do if you want to get office; but it is not the policy I have ever adopted. I have laid the principles of my party before my constituents and left it to them to decide, and I have denounced nobody. Renunciation gets nowhere. It never placed a law on the statute book. No man who has any sense would make a campaign along those lines. Senator Hopkins made these bitter enemies among the Democrats, and they were willing to vote for anybody to defeat him in his desire to be returned to this body.

We come now to DeWolf. You have heard his name mentioned on this floor. What about DeWolf? DeWolf stated upon the stand that he was ready to vote for Hopkins, and that he was going to try to get other Democrats to vote for Hopkins, to break the deadlock; that he was tired of his service in Springfield and wanted to get back home to his farm and attend to his own business, and that not only would he vote for Hopkins, but everybody in Springfield at that time knew he would vote for any Republican or any Democrat who could be elected to break the deadlock. When the roll was called he voted for me for the same reason that he was willing to vote for anybody else.

Then we come to Senator Broderick, who voted for me. You have all heard his name. Senator Broderick I have known (I can not measure the time) for probably more than 15 years. My old district is filled with Senator Broderick's friends and relatives. There never was a time when I had a contest in the district, and these same newspapers that are hounding me now and always have hounded me undertook to drive me out of Congress, when, without any solicitation on my part, Senator Broderick sent word to his Democratic friends in the district and went there himself and pleaded with them, and asked them to vote for LORIMER and they did vote for LORIMER.

Let me say now, if it had not been for the support I received from Democrats in that congressional district when these assassins of character were trying to destroy me, I would not have been in the Lower House of Congress, much less occupying a seat in this body to-day.

I never solicited a vote from a Democrat under false pretenses. No Democrat who ever voted for me ever thought that

when I was sent to Congress I would support the principles of the great party to which he belonged. No Democrat was ever deceived into voting for me for a seat in Congress. Everybody knows, and with God's help everybody will know, where I stand on every question until my time shall come to leave this earth.

So it was not from deception that I received that support, nor was it from deception or by deception that I received the support of Broderick when he voted for me for United States Senator.

Senator Gorman, another Democrat, lives in the old district I represented that gave a Democratic majority of all the way from 5,000 to 17,000 every election we had except the elections when I was a candidate for a seat in the house of representatives. In every election except one Senator Gorman, as a Democrat, voted for me. He was one of the best friends I had in that congressional district. The only time he ever voted against me was when his chum ran in opposition to me. When he was elected to the senate the first time I went to Springfield I met him in the St. Nicholas Hotel and he began the discussion of this Senatorship. He said, "If the time ever comes, LORIMER, that the Democrats and the Republicans can elect you, depend upon me to do what I have always done, to vote for you when the roll is called."

Senators Rainey and Jandus and I were raised in the same neighborhood. The same is true of Representatives Cermak and Forst. I was associated with them and with their friends for many years.

Representative Geshkewich I have known for more than 15 years. I have known him at home; I have known him in the legislature; I have known him in political contests in my city and my county, and he would have gone further to serve me than he would have gone to have served any Democrat in our State. That is why I got Geshkewich's vote.

I am not going to give all the history and all the reasons that led up to the friendships which grew up between these Democrats and myself over a period of 40 years, but I think it is due to the Senate that I should relate one or two of the circumstances that finally led up to the voting of Democrats for a Republican.

John Griffin voted for me. John Griffin lives in the neighborhood I lived in 40 years ago. I can not remember just when it was that I made his acquaintance; it is so far back. We have been friends all that time. But that was not the single reason why Griffin voted for me.

When I was a boy and started out in the world the first dollar I made was by selling newspapers. I had been well taken care of at home, with no responsibility, with nothing to look after. I had been brought up as mothers would bring up their boys if they had all to do with it; almost at mother's apron strings all the time. At the time it became necessary for me to go out and earn a living I was 10 years old. I had had no experience. I knew nothing about where to turn. Friends in the neighborhood suggested that I might make a dollar by selling papers in the morning, and I began peddling papers and blacking boots.

After I had been at work for a time (I remember it as well as if it were yesterday) I went over to the Tribune building

and down into the basement and bought 50 Tribunes. In those days the papers were not folded as they are now. They were counted out, first the heading and then the supplement, and shoved out of the window to the boy purchasing them; and then he went away into a doorway or hallway and folded them and put them together.

One Sunday morning as I came up out of the basement a crowd of boys surrounded me. Some held me by the hands and others by the throat, and they pulled my headings out from under my arm and then let me go. They disappeared. I was standing there brooding not only over the dollar that I might have made out of the sale of those papers, but the dollar and a half that I had paid for them, because the supplement was of no value without the heading, when another boy came along with an armful of papers and asked me what was the matter, why I was so downcast. I told him the story. He looked at me for a moment and handed his papers over to me and said, "Stand back there in the doorway. Stay there until I come back." He went away, and in about five minutes he returned and he had my headings in his hand. He said, "Here are your papers. Now see to it that they don't take them away from you again." Out of that little incident grew a friendship to the extent that almost every week I helped him. We had in our town at that time a Saturday afternoon paper called the Gazette. In the territory that I worked I sold all of mine, and this boy usually had some left over. We used to call it in those days getting "stuck." He would give them to me and I would take them up into my territory and sell them for him. Sometimes there was only one paper, but it saved him 5 cents and he made the profit on it of another 5 cents. Sometimes there were half a dozen, and he saved his 30 cents and made a profit of 30 cents.

That friendship grew up on that basis. A dollar and a half he had saved for me, and one dollar was more to me, Senator Roor, in those days than \$1,000,000 would be to many of the people of this country to-day. What grew up out of that little incident was a friendship and a gratitude that has lasted for over 40 years. This man that I speak of as a man now was a boy then. He was a sort of a hero with the newsboys—a sort of a king of the crowd—and what he said they should do they did.

I have no doubt that Senators in this chamber have heard his name because the newspapers of my town are ringing with it every day. In those days we called him Hiaky Dink. His name is Michael Kenna. The nickname has followed him to this day. He is the leading Democrat in the neighborhood in which he lives. John Griffin represents that district. When the papers published the story that LORIMER would probably be a candidate for Senator he came to my office and said to me substantially this:

Bill, I understand you are going to be a candidate for United States Senator, and that you can not be elected unless you get Democratic votes. You can depend upon it that if your name is presented John Griffin will vote for you if no other member of the legislature does.

Can the Senator from New York understand a situation of that kind? Has he ever come up through conditions of that sort, which bind men together more firmly than all the things that can be done for him when he has grown to manhood—after he has been successful?

When we quit selling papers Michael Kenna went one way and I went another. He became a Democrat and I became a Republican. But there never has been a time in 40 years when we could help each other that we have failed to do it without solicitation, and almost invariably without notifying the other of our performance of what we considered our duty unless it was necessary to do so. It may be the Senator from New York and the Senator from South Dakota and some other Senators can not understand that kind of a friendship.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LORIMER. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think there is a person on the face of the earth a story of that kind does not appeal to. I want to say to the Senator from Illinois he is not the only poor boy who has made his way through hardships to the Senate, and he can not plead that he is the only one.

Mr. LORIMER. I am not pleading that I am the only one who has made his way through this world and is now sitting in the Senate, nor am I pleading poverty or hard knocks as a reason why I should sit in this body. I am giving to the Senators the truth as to why these men voted for me for United States Senator. I am not pleading for sympathy. I do not want sympathy. This is not a question of sympathy. It is a question of right or wrong. If the Senate can believe me to be the low, vile creature the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New York and other Senators who have talked against me would have you believe me to be, then there is a plain duty staring you squarely in the face, regardless of the testimony in this record. If I could be the foul wretch that you, Senators, have sought to paint me, regardless of how I came here, by right or by wrong, I should be driven from yonder door with the stamp of infamy branded upon my back. I am not pleading for sympathy. I am trying to narrate the truth of my election as it was, not as Senators would have the Senate believe it.

Then I come to another, George Hilton, a Democrat, a member of the legislature, and he has been for many years. In my State there is a great deal of patronage that is known as "the minority patronage" given to Democrats. In my career of over 20 years, and on account of the position I have held in my party, I have had much to say about the disposition of that patronage. Several years ago it happened to fall to me to suggest that George Hilton should be appointed to the chief bailiff's office in my city, a place that pays him well, and a place for the holding of which he is very much gratified.

Representative Hruba was also a boy from my own neighborhood. I have helped him and his friends for the past 25 years.

Walter A. Lantz, a member of the general assembly, is a man who, through my assistance, was appointed a member of the civil service board of the county in which I live.

John J. McLaughlin and George L. McConnell are both members from the congressional district where I live. I have known them both many years. I do not know how many favors they have done for me or how many I have done for them, but I would say that they are probably almost innumerable.

Thomas J. O'Brien, John O'Neil and John J. Poulton are men with whom or with whose close political friends I have been associated ever since I have been in politics.

John P. Walsh is a resident of my former congressional district. He is now and has been for years in the circuit clerks' office of our county, at the suggestion of my friends and myself.

John C. Werdell, Frank Wilson and Bob Wilson—Frank Wilson I have known for years.

Peter F. Galligan. I do not know how long I have known Peter, but Peter has been a Democrat all these years; a leader in the Democratic party; for many years a member of the legislature; and at one time he served in the senate of our State. So partisan is Peter, or so partisan was Peter, that, though I was his friend, he would not ask a favor from me; yet at the same time he would go any length to serve me; but about 15 years ago when everybody was broke, when everybody was hard up, Peter, with the balance of us, was also hard up. It was the most trying time of his life. Peter's wife was sick—sick unto death—and he did not have a dollar at home, no money to pay the doctor, nor any money to buy medicine, no money to furnish coal to keep the home warm. Then he came to me and related his circumstances. I secured an appointment for him, out of which he received a fair salary, with which he was able to take care of his sick wife and give to her such nourishment as she required during those long painful days, and finally, to give her a decent burial. He had gone to all his friends; he had called on all his Democratic leaders for help, but he had called in vain. When he came to me I was fortunate enough to be able to help him, and from that day to this the gratitude of Peter F. Galligan has made him almost my willing slave. There is nothing in the world within the bounds of decency, there is no honorable thing that he might do that I would ask him to do, that he would not do with the greatest of pleasure. The day I was elected in the house of representatives in Springfield, when I was called upon to address that body, just before I went up to the speaker's desk, I was met by Peter Galligan with the tears streaming down his cheeks, tears of joy, tears of great pleasure, tears of gratitude for an opportunity that had been afforded him to pay back what he thought was a great obligation, but which to me amounted to nothing at all. It was that sort of thing that made Peter Galligan my friend; it was that act that made him my devoted friend; and I know there is no man in Illinois—I care not to what party he belongs—for whom Peter Galligan would go so far or make so many sacrifices, or would give up so much for, as he would for me. When he cast his vote he did not think he was making a sacrifice, because in the house of representatives when the roll was called and his name was reached—because Republicans and Democrats had stated upon that floor that the Democrats who voted for me would live to rue the day, that they would be ostracized and driven out of the party—when his name was called, he said: "Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the statements made here. I will not be ostracized from my party; I will not rue the day that I vote for LORIMER. When the people from my district know that I am returning after this vote is cast, they will meet me at the depot with a brass band, and say, 'Here comes our hero.'" Peter Galligan is now a member of the general

assembly, re-elected after his vote cast for me, and re-elected by an overwhelming majority.

Much has been said of Emanuel A. Abrahams—"Manny" Abrahams they say, and that was what we called him when he was a boy. "The bellwether," "the bellwether," goes ringing all through the speech of the Senator from New York. How about "Manny" Abrahams? It is only a short story, and I will tell you a little of "Manny" Abrahams.

When I was about 20 years of age I was running a street car on South Halsted street in Chicago. In those days, early in the morning the loads were all carried down town, and coming back we had very few passengers. About that time the Jews were moving over into the neighborhood of Halsted and Twelfth Streets—only a few; but as time went on the numbers increased. They were all industrious men. They came to Halsted and Twelfth Streets to take a car to go out to the suburbs with their big packs of goods and work their way home, disposing of their wares during the day. In those days we had a rule which permitted the conductor either to take or reject passengers with large packages. Then the prejudice against that people in that neighborhood was very strong and very bitter. Many of the conductors when they arrived at Twelfth Street would refuse, even with an empty car, to allow them to ride. Frequently I have seen those men get on the car with a pack, lay it on the platform, and have seen the conductor stop the car and kick the pack out into the street, and then the car moved on, and the passenger stayed there or else he walked out into the suburbs. Either my folk taught me to have prejudice against nobody or God made me that way. So I have no prejudice against anybody of any nationality. When I came along in the morning and had no passengers I always took those men on board with their packs and carried them out to the end of the line, until I became known among them as the man they could ride with. So they waited for my car. It turned out after awhile that every morning I would get a large load of those men. In increased numbers they moved into that neighborhood. I was known as their friend. It was a small thing to do, and there was no reason why men should have any gratitude on account of me permitting them to ride and pay their fares; but they did have it. After I quit service on the cars I lived in the same ward with those people and as they came in I became better acquainted with them.

Then I entered into politics. When I entered into politics not one of them was ever permitted to vote at the polls. Nobody would let them have anything to do with or allowed them to go near the polls; and if they undertook to go there, they were insulted, abused, assaulted, and knocked down, bricks were thrown at them, and they were driven from the polls. I organized every precinct in which they lived, and we gave them protection. It got so they came to my home at night and talked over their little troubles. There might be a dozen or probably fifty coming to my home, laying their little troubles at my door and asking for help. I helped them always. Then I moved out of the neighborhood; but when I go down there now to attend a meeting—and I go there about once every year or two; they have large halls and large meetings—I am met there by the old citizens and the rabbis of the neighborhood; I am taken around and introduced to the newcomers. I am not introduced as "Mr.

LORIMER;" I am not presented as "Congressman LORIMER;" I was not made acquainted with these people as "Senator LORIMER;" but I was taken from one to the other and introduced as "the Father." Does the Senator from New York know what that means? When people come to believe in you, when they come to trust you and almost to revere you, as these people do me, when they come to the point of introducing you as "the Father," that is the greatest compliment that race of people can pay to any man. Whether I deserve that confidence or not, whether I have earned their gratitude or not, that is the condition there, and any man who would declare for the political, for the business, for the financial, or for the social destruction of LORIMER and run for office in that district could not get votes enough to make a respectable showing. No man can go among those people into that district as my enemy and live politically—I state that not in any sense of boasting, but because it is a matter of fact—and "Manny" Abrahams could not have gone back home and looked his people in the face if I had been a candidate and had been beaten by 1 vote and he had failed to vote for me.

"Manny" Abrahams the bellwether! I say it goes ringing all through the speech of the Senator from New York. For what purpose? For any other purpose than to create prejudice? I wish I could think so. A bellwether; the first man on the roll call for everybody to follow, as though a bellwether was a new thing in legislative bodies, as though we had never heard of a bellwether here, as though they had never had a bellwether in the House of Representatives, or as though they had never had a bellwether in any legislative body in the United States. We have our bellwether here; we have the Democratic bellwether; we have the "insurgent" bellwether [laughter], and we have the "stalwart" bellwether. When I happen to be absent from this Chamber and the bell rings announcing the roll call, if I chance to step in the door in time to hear the name of Senator ALDRICH called, he is my bellwether. [Laughter.] I know where my vote belongs, and I vote as he votes. If he happens to be absent, I listen to the roll call until the clerk comes to the name of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, and then, when he has voted, Senator CULLOM becomes my bellwether. I know where to vote from that time on. If I happen to get in a little later, I wait for the roll call to reach Senator GALLINGER's name; and after he has voted I know my place. Then we go along a little further, and if I happen to come in after he has answered the roll call, I wait until Senator LODGE has voted. [Laughter.] Then, if I find that he and Senator LA FOLLETTE have voted the same way, I wait for somebody else to vote, and then somebody else becomes my bellwether. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

Senators know that when the roll is called they walk in the door and ask "How is our vote." I have heard many a Democrat say that. I sit on this side with them. I do not want to know their secrets; but sometimes they talk too loud; and they ask that question so that I can not avoid hearing it. So I know they have a bellwether. While I do not know it as a matter of fact, I venture the statement that the time has been, I will go a little farther than that, and say the time will come, when the Senator from New York will walk into this Chamber some day when the roll is being called and ask somebody in whom he has confidence "How is our vote" and then vote that way.

Why, Mr. President, the talk about "bellwether" is all nonsense. There is a bellwether in every legislative assembly in this country, and so long as there are parties and so long as there are principles that divide parties, there will be bellwethers. The talk of bellwethers fools nobody; it will create no suspicion that will injure anybody either in this forum or in the House of Representatives or in any other legislative body in this country or anywhere else, unless it be upon the Chautauqua platform. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, grave charges have been made against my right to hold a seat in this body. If I read the speeches of Senators rightly, and if I understand what they mean—some of them go even to the extent of making almost the direct charge—if I understand them at all, they would leave an impression upon this body that I was elected by bribery and corruption, and that not only was I elected by bribery and corruption, but that I was on hand aiding it, giving it the stamp of my approval, and sanctioning it. In proof of that statement they point out that Lee O'Neil Browne was my agent—my authorized agent. What else can it mean? They would have you believe that Lee O'Neil Browne tied up in one package 30 Democratic votes, carried them into the hall of the general assembly, dumped them down there, bought body and soul, and sold and delivered them to me. I can understand how that might make an impression on Senators who know nothing about the situation and know nothing about the politics of my State. But here, Mr. President, is a list of 34 Democrats that were for me for United States Senator on my account, and not because Lee O'Neil Browne delivered them to me.

Democratic waterways support.—Senator Hearn; Representatives Blair, Espy, Gorman, Link, Riley, Staymates, H. A. Shephard.

Anti-Hopkins.—Representatives Alschuler, Luke.

To end deadlock.—Representative De Wolf.

Democrat personal support.—Senators Broderick, Gorman, Jandus, Rainey; Representatives Abrahams, Cermak, Forst, Geskewich, Griffin, Hilton, Hruby, Lantz, McLaughlin, McConnell, E. J. Murphy, O'Brien, O'Neill, Poulton, Walsh, Werdell, F. J. Wilson, R. E. Wilson, Galligan.

Seventeen or 18—19, I think it was—of the men who belonged to Lee O'Neil Browne's faction who voted for me, would have voted for me if I had been a candidate for Senator, even though Lee O'Neil Browne labored with them throughout the whole session—if I had been a candidate through the whole session—to oppose me. He did not deliver them. They delivered him. They were my friends, and there is not one of them who would not have gone further on a personal matter for me than they would have gone for Lee O'Neil Browne, and many of them would have made more sacrifices for me personally than they would for any Democrat in the State of Illinois; and I measure my words when I make that statement. Thirty-four of the 53, for one personal reason or another, voted for me and pleaded with the other 19 Democrats and prevailed upon them to vote for me also. That is the history of that vote.

Much has been made in statements here upon this floor of the fact that I am a personal friend of Speaker Shurtleff, and the further fact that during my stay in Springfield I occupied the speaker's room at the capitol; that I met Shepherd in the speaker's room, and that I talked with members in the speaker's room, and that it was a suspicious circumstance that I should occupy the speaker's room. That may be so in other States. I do not know anything about the speaker's room in other States,

or the privacy of his room in other States, but I do know all about the speaker's room in the State of Illinois. Mr. President, the speaker's room of the State of Illinois is practically the same size as the Marble Room outside of this Senate Chamber. It has more lounges and sofas in it than we have in the Marble Room. It has more chairs than we have in the Marble Room. It has a much greater seating capacity than the Marble Room. Our legislative assembly hall has a seating arrangement all around the outside of the members' chairs.

I do not know how it is in your State, but I know how it is in mine. Anyone introduced by a member is free to go in and take possession of these seats in the assembly room. They walk down the aisles and they sit and talk to the members, and if they are interrupting the legislative proceedings by their talk they go out into the speaker's room. In fact, anybody who goes to Springfield and is acquainted with a member of the legislature may go into the speaker's room. It is a meeting place. Democrats go there and Republicans go there, and they take their friends there, and they sit and they talk and they smoke there. It is more of a smoking room than a room of privacy, and the door of the room is never locked, except in the morning before the opening of the session, when the steering committee is occupying it, preparing the work for the legislative day.

Great stress is laid on the fact that LORIMER was present in Springfield when he was elected and that he occupied the speaker's room. Has any Member of this Senate ever sat in the speaker's room of the capitol of his State? Has any Senator here ever sat in the speaker's room while the roll was being called that elected him to this body? If he was there, was it a sign of bribery and corruption?

Oh, Mr. President, if that is to be adopted as the rule, I do not know how men are going to get votes when they want to be elected to this great forum. Surely, I never will intimate to anybody anywhere that because a man who was elected to this body was present in his capitol and sitting in the speaker's room when the roll was being called, and talked to the Members of the legislature in that room, that such is evidence of bribery and corrupt practices; and I do not think, Mr. President, anybody else will think so. I do not believe anybody will pay attention or give any weight at all to a statement of that kind, which I fear was made to cast a cloud of suspicion. It is not and can not be evidence of anything either good or bad, and it could have had no other purpose except to unsettle the minds of Senators and probably lead them to believe that maybe something was wrong.

Mr. President, if the securing of Democratic votes is an evidence of wrong doing, then I have been doing wrong for the past 25 years. If the securing of Democratic votes, either for myself or for my party or for the candidates of my party is an evidence of corruption, then I have been a corruptionist ever since I was a boy. I was brought up in a Democratic neighborhood, and the thing that took me into politics was not the hope of political preferment. I was a Republican, and there was nobody in the precinct to give me a Republican ballot the day I went to cast my first vote for James G. Blaine. All the precincts around my home were made up almost solidly of Democrats—500 Democratic votes and two or three Republican votes. There were not enough members of my party in a precinct to fill up the quota of judges and clerks and ticket peddlers on

election day. I was only 24 years old then, and I voted for Blaine, and I doubt if there was a more enthusiastic Blaineite in this country than I was, and nobody was more disappointed than I was at his defeat. I concluded that if all the country was managed in my party as the territory that I lived in was managed, that that in itself, applied to New York, was enough to defeat Blaine for the presidency. I made up my mind that that would never happen in my election precinct again.

So I began to organize, not to become a leader of my party, but to take care of my own precinct two days in a year, and see that the ballots were there for Republicans when they came to vote. That precinct was organized and then the other precincts were organized, because once the political virus is injected into the white man there is no telling where he will stop. So I went into the next precinct and organized that. And how? With Republicans? No. There were no Republicans there. With Democrats, young men of my age who had never affiliated with their party, but thought they were Democrats because their good fathers were Democrats. They joined with us, and we organized one precinct after another until the whole ward was organized.

We did not go out calling Democrats names. We did not abuse Democrats. We told them the things our party stood for, and asked them to join us on that account; and after a while, with energy and industry, we had a splendid organization in every precinct in the ward; and we were not in politics, or at least we did not know we were. But we had not been in politics over two years until we sent a Republican alderman to the council from that ward, and that Republican organization spread from that ward to other wards until the Republican leaders of our county began to look to that section of the county for their Republican majority.

But for the organization in that section the city of Chicago would have been as strongly Democratic for the past 20 years as is the city of New York.

This organization, my friends, was bred not in malice, not in denunciation, but it was bred in principle and fostered by telling what we thought was the truth, and in good fellowship to each other. It was not very long until the leaders of the party all over the county looked to our territory; and without knowing it, or rather without realizing it, and surely not knowing the reason why, I was pushed forward, made the leader in my party of that Democratic section of the county.

I do not know whether Senators who do not live in a large city and a large county understand what that means. In our city and in our county in those days we had at the disposal of the party in power anywhere from 12,000 to 15,000 places, according to the season of the year, and when the Republican party came into control of the city for the first time in my career, in 1887, the disposition of all the patronage in that section of the town fell into my hands. I knew nothing about it. To be truthful, I did not know what to do with it. I disposed of it as best I could, and it was disposed of among the people in our neighborhood, and these young men that came from Democratic families into our party were chiefly the recipients of what we had.

From that time to this no man has ever come to my home, no man has ever come to my office to ask me to do him a favor, little or big, that, unless it was a strictly party matter, I ever asked him his politics. I do not know and I can not know whether

I properly carried out my obligations in the disposition of those places or not; I do not know what people would think about it; but I do know that in the territory from which I come 90 per cent of the Democrats, whether they vote for me or not, will tell you they would rather have LORIMER in Congress or LORIMER in any place he wants to go than any man in their own party.

As I have stated before, it is not because I have ever deceived a Democrat. No Democrat ever thought I would vote with his party when he voted for me. A very distinguished senator and elderly Democrat in the Illinois General Assembly came to me—and unless Senators ask his name I shall withhold it—a few days before I was elected and he said: “LORIMER, you know I would like to vote for you, but I live down in a Democratic country, where it is hard to forgive a Democrat if he votes for a Republican; I think you ought to be sent to the Senate, and if you will vote there with the Democrats on the tariff I will vote for you.” I said to him: “Senator, I can not do that.” He thought for a moment or two. “Well,” he said, “I will go a little further with you. If you will vote with Senator LA FOLLETTE and his followers in the Senate on the tariff bill I will vote for you. That is not going the whole distance, but I can go back to my district and my people will not destroy me politically because I voted for you if you will vote that way.” I told him I could not do that. Then he said, “Well, I am sorry; I would like to vote for you; I would like to see you in the Senate; but I can not afford to do it unless you can do something to make the way easy for me.”

So it is that at no time and at no place have I ever had Democratic support on account of any reason except pure, unadulterated friendship. In the last campaign in which I was elected to Congress, when I was unable even to sign a letter to be sent out to my constituency, that district gave approximately 12,000 majority to President Taft. He received the largest vote and the largest majority—or his electors did, and I take the elector who received the highest vote in the district. He received a larger vote than any person other than myself running in that district. I did not make one speech, and I did not see one man, and I got more than thirty-five hundred plurality more than President Taft.

Of what is that an evidence? Is that an evidence of bribery? Is it an evidence of corrupting Democrats to vote for me? If it is, then Mr. President I have a trail of corrupted Democrats following me over my career of 25 years. If they were bought with money I would have been compelled to buy them by the tens of thousands, and according to the theory that is contended for here it would have cost millions of dollars.

Mr. President, it is an easy matter to intimate that any man is guilty of wrongdoing, and once the intimation is made, I regret to say, it is an easy matter for many people to believe it. But when one is charged with wrongdoing, the facts should be laid before the judging body. They should be the unqualified and unadulterated truth, and that applies more largely, in my opinion, to the question of unseating a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives than it does to taking the life or the liberty or the property of a citizen. To turn a member from this or any other legislative body on the suspicion that if certain things happened, certain other things might happen, would be establishing a rule that would indeed soon destroy this Republic.

No man, not even the Tribune, has ever dared to charge that I was ever remotely guilty of bribery or corrupt practices; and I never did, not only in this election but in any other election, use one dollar, or allow the use of one dollar, or knowingly permit the use of one dollar, nor had I the remotest idea or knowledge of the use of one dollar for my election, the corrupt use of it for bribery, or for any other corrupt purpose, either to the lower house or to this body. If Senators even suggest that they think I did have knowledge of any corrupt practices of any kind, have the knowledge in any degree, I am very sorry for it. On my word as a man—and even the Tribune will not say to you or intimate to you that they know of any time I ever even remotely broke that word or violated faith; even they will not say to you that I am guilty of that act—I never gave nor do I know of any other person giving any kind of a promise, or any money, or anything else as an inducement for them to vote for me.

My regret, Mr. President, is that anybody should think so. I claim nothing more for myself than any other man. I am not possessed of any more virtues than any other decent citizen of this country. In the life I have lived and worked for 40 years, I may not have succeeded, but I have tried, as hard as a human being can try, to live a life that would make me at least acceptable to the decent citizens of my community. I have tried for 40 years to live a life that will make my neighbors and my townsmen and the people of my State have confidence in me. I say I may not have succeeded, but God knows I have tried. But if I have failed, if I did not succeed, no living man will come to my door and lay the charge of practicing bribery or corrupt practices in any election that I ever was interested in, be it for myself or for anybody else. I regret that there are Senators in this Chamber who feel that they have been able to find anything at all in my business life, in my political career, in my social life, or in my life with my family, that will justify them in even having a suspicion that I have been guilty of the charges they would lay at my door.

I say again, on my word as a man and on my word as a Senator, I am not guilty, and I have no knowledge in the remotest degree that bribery and corruption were practiced in securing a seat for me in this body. No matter what the Tribune says, no matter what they have been able to do through coercion in the State attorney's office in my county, I do not believe that votes were bought by anybody to send me to this body.

I have stated that I knew something about my election to this body, and I have stated to you what I know about it. What I have stated to you is the truth. Even the Tribune will not dare to refute the statement that these 34 Democrats voted for me for the reason I have stated to you, and that they secured the balance of the Democratic votes; and instead of Lee O'Neil Browne, who was friendly to me and who did help me and to whom I am obligated, delivering these 53 votes from the Democratic Party to me when I was elected United States Senator, they, with their influence, with their talk, with their persuasion, delivered Lee O'Neil Browne if there was any delivery of anybody at any time during my election. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT: Occupants of the galleries will refrain from applause. It is not permitted under the usages of the Senate.

JK
1197
61st
I3L67
1911
RARE
BK RM